



Paulson, J. (2015). 'Whether and how?' History education about recent and ongoing conflict: A review of research. *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, 1(1), 115-141.  
<https://doi.org/10.17609/N84H20>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.17609/N84H20](https://doi.org/10.17609/N84H20)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via INEE at <http://www.ineesite.org/en/journal/vol1-num1>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

# “WHETHER AND HOW?” HISTORY EDUCATION ABOUT RECENT AND ONGOING CONFLICT: A REVIEW OF RESEARCH

JULIA PAULSON

*This article reviews research on history education that addresses recent or ongoing conflict since 1990. History education is recognized as a key site for constructing identity, transmitting collective memory, and shaping “imagined communities,” which makes its revision or reform a complex and important part of Education in Emergencies work. The article reviews 42 empirical studies from 11 countries, exploring whether recent conflict forms part of national curricula and, where it does, how this teaching is approached. Young people learn about recent conflict in all of the cases reviewed; in the majority, curriculum is one source for this learning, but in some cases the history of recent conflict is taught without curricular guidance or not at all. Where recent conflict is taught, the review finds a reliance on a traditional, collective memory approach to disseminating national narratives, although often in social studies rather than history classrooms. In many cases, these narratives are top-down and ethno-nationalist and rely on devices like mythical past unity and the exceptionalism of conflict. The review concludes by suggesting that actors undertaking a revision or reform of history curriculum attend to recent conflict as an “active past” and offers some promising ideas for approaching such a past in history curricula.*

## INTRODUCTION

Much of the early work that has come to ground the field of Education in Emergencies (EiE) highlighted the need to engage with curricular issues in the aftermath of violent conflict (e.g., Buckland 2005; Davies 2004; Pigozzi 1999; Sinclair 2002; Tawil and Harley 2004). Curriculum has remained a focus as the field has grown. As a minimum standard, the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE; 2010a, 1) envisages “culturally, socially and linguistically relevant curricula,” and its Guidance Notes on Teaching and Learning (INEE

Received July 15, 2014; peer reviewed September 14, 2014, December 30, 2014; revised November 22, 2014; accepted January 10, 2015; electronically published March 8, 2015.

*Journal on Education in Emergencies*, Vol. 1, No. 1.

© 2015 by the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). All rights reserved.

ISBN: 978-1-4951-4601-5

2010b, 2) are clear about the “immediate need” to eliminate bias and remove “conflict-inciting materials and ideologically-loaded content.” Beyond these immediate actions, however, education actors must grapple with questions of how (and whether) to deal with the history of recent conflict in curriculum.

A number of scholars draw attention to the importance of these questions and their implications for reconciliation and peacebuilding (e.g., Beckerman and Zembylas 2011; Cole and Barsalou 2006; Cole 2007; Weinstein et al. 2007). However, knowledge of how they are actually dealt with in practice is limited, as is understanding of the implications of decisions taken about history teaching for wider processes of peacebuilding and reconciliation. Case studies have been published in journals or collected in edited volumes (e.g., Cole 2007; Stover and Weinstein 2004; Tawil and Harley 2004; Williams 2014), but a thorough analysis of existing academic research has not been undertaken. In this paper I seek to offer such an analysis. I aim to synthesize and critically interpret existing academic research in order to identify trends, common challenges, and promising practice, and to consider their implications. I review research into history education that addresses recent or ongoing conflict since 1990; I selected this period because it coincides with the emergence and development of EiE as field of research and practice (Burde et al. 2013).

History education is recognized as a key site for constructing identity, transmitting collective memory, and shaping “imagined communities” (Anderson 1991). It provides young people with narratives about self, other, and nation, and it signals to them what is important to know about their past. EiE research has highlighted the ways that history education can contribute to violent conflict, for instance, by reinforcing sectarian identities, offering negative and stereotypical images of the “other,” and naturalizing the victimhood or superiority of particular groups (e.g., Davies 2004). The legacy of history education is one of a multitude of considerations that face education actors in situations affected by conflict. As Zembylas and Beckerman (2008, 126) state, “The debate is not just about whether children should be taught to remember the past, but also about how the past is interpreted” (original emphasis).

These “whether and how” questions provide the organizing framework for this review. However, recent “profound controversy regarding the function of history teaching in educational systems” (Carretero et al. 2012, 1) means that history can no longer be taken for granted as a taught subject, as it is often replaced by or subsumed within social studies or civics subjects. My analysis of existing research is therefore oriented around the following questions: (1) How is history education approached in contexts affected by conflict? (2) Is recent and/or ongoing conflict part of history curriculum? (3) Where recent conflict is part of the history curriculum, how is it approached? Answers to these questions are important for at least two reasons. First, they begin to shed light on how important curricular

decisions are dealt with in practice, an underdeveloped area in EiE research. Second, they point to emerging trends in education practice and bring together the critical analyses of multiple researchers, highlighting positive avenues whereby history education might contribute to peacebuilding and reconciliation, as well as approaches that are unlikely to contribute to building peace postconflict.

In answer to the first question, the review reveals a trend toward the “social sciencization” of history education in the conflict-affected contexts explored. Despite this, the use of national narrative to teach about conflict persists. Not only is this collective memory approach to history as a subject adopted in a number of countries, it is often also used for teaching the history of conflict within social studies. In answer to the second question, the review finds that the history of recent or ongoing conflict is taught in schools in the majority of the cases explored, although in some cases this happens without any official curricular guidance. Researchers studying contexts where recent conflict is not part of the curriculum posit that classroom discussions may help to mediate and contextualize knowledge about conflict that young people develop despite curricular silence. Finally, in answer to the third question, this review demonstrates that recent or ongoing conflict is often approached in curricula in problematic ways. Specifically, approaches either fail to challenge ethno-nationalist narratives, impose a narrative of mythical unity, or present conflict as exceptional and disconnected from present realities. These approaches are unlikely to capitalize on the potential that history education may hold to contribute to building peace in the aftermath of conflict. The next section outlines the method used for this review, after which the findings are presented in more detail.

## REVIEW METHOD

This article reviews research centered around history curriculum and recent and/or ongoing conflict. Its aims are (1) to identify research into history education in conflict-affected contexts, and (2) to critically interpret and synthesize this research in order to identify trends, challenges, and promising practice.

Systematic reviews, which bring “together what is known from the research literature using explicit and accountable methods” (Gough et al. 2012, 1), generally synthesize the findings of studies that use experimental controlled designs, which research in the areas of history education and EiE does not tend to do (see Burde and Linden 2013 for a noteworthy exception). However, as Gough and colleagues (2012, 1) note, “the logic of systematic methods for reviewing the literature can be applied to all areas of research.” This logic of transparency and comprehensiveness inspires this review. However, I do not aspire to paint a definitive picture or to claim that this review has successfully uncovered every relevant study. Gough and colleagues distinguish between reviews that aim to aggregate

evidence in order to test predefined concepts and make empirical statements, and those that aim to configure and interpret research in order to develop concepts and understanding. This review is configurative. I hope it will be considered thorough, but its main contribution lies in the unique synthesis of research that it presents. This synthesis provides insight into EiE curricular practice around the world and offers a preliminary assessment of its promise, as well as the challenges this practice faces in contributing to peacebuilding.

In this review, I include only published academic research. I have chosen not to include grey literature, government or agency programming documents, or any unpublished evaluations of agency or government programs. I made this choice because the theoretically grounded analyses of researchers are important for the configurative work that this review seeks to do (aim 2). I am interested in decisions taken about history education in conflict-affected contexts, in how these decisions are implemented, and, perhaps most importantly, in their implications. These implications are often best captured and contextualized by academic research, which tends to adopt a critical lens and to explore curriculum not just in terms of its programmatic effectiveness, but also in terms of its place within and contribution to wider postconflict dynamics. Nonetheless, reviews that focus on grey literature around history education programming would complement the findings of this review, as would research that directly collects the perspectives of policy makers, historians, and EiE actors.

I conducted English language title and abstract searches of EBSCO Host, JSTOR, and Google Scholar databases using combinations of the search terms: education, history, conflict, postconflict, curriculum, violent, past, and teaching. Schucan Bird and Tripney's (2011) evaluation of comprehensive search strategies for policy-relevant, interdisciplinary reviews found that general bibliographic databases and specialist databases were effective, efficient, and value-added search strategies. I complemented these with additional sources found via snowball sampling from reference lists, and from my less systematic collection over the last decade of research around history education in conflict-affected contexts.

I reviewed results first by title, which in many cases was sufficient to eliminate studies based on relevance. I then reviewed the remaining sources by abstract and finally by a full reading. In total, 42 studies are included.<sup>1</sup> Given my focus on academic research, all studies included present empirical findings and were published either in a peer-reviewed journal or in an academic authored or edited book; conference proceedings, theses, and dissertations are not included.

I have limited the conflict-affected contexts considered to those where violent conflict ended no earlier than 1990 or is still unresolved, which allows the review to coincide with the period since 1990 in which EiE has developed as a field. I did

---

<sup>1</sup> Some studies consider history education in more than one country.

not adopt a single definition of conflict as a search parameter in this review. I considered limiting the review to postconflict contexts, as Quaynor (2012) does in her review of citizenship education, but this would have eliminated Israel/Palestine and Cyprus, two cases where research in this area is most developed. I also considered limiting cases of recent or ongoing conflict to those that met the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (2014) definition of armed conflict in at least one year since 1990. Again, this would have excluded research focused on Cyprus, which is both rich and relevant. Since the relevant time period for this review is a total of 24 years (1990-2014), I have included studies published in the 1990s ( $n = 1$ ), 2000s ( $n = 22$ ) and 2010s ( $n = 19$ ). In most of the countries covered by the review, at least one study is relatively recent (published in the 2010s). Nonetheless, the review findings should not be considered completely up-to-date descriptions of each of the contexts explored but a presentation of trends across published research and their implications.

I required that studies relate to an education system and therefore excluded research that focused exclusively on an isolated initiative or a single school or classroom. This meant that I excluded a good deal of research, particularly studies on Israel/Palestine that explored or evaluated particular educational initiatives. Finally, I selected only studies explicitly addressing history education in conflict-affected contexts—in other words, studies that addressed related subjects like peace education, citizenship education, ethical or moral education, etc., were not included unless they also included a significant focus on history. This criterion again excluded a number of studies focused on Israel/Palestine, and also on Northern Ireland. Limiting the review in these ways kept it tightly focused and relevant to EiE and allowed for some degree of comparability across the studies included. The 42 studies included are listed in Appendix 1, which also provides an overview of how each study contributed to the analysis described below.

I used framework synthesis to answer research questions 1 and 2. This approach, which extracts and synthesizes findings according to an a priori framework (Barnett-Page and Thomas 2009), was appropriate where individual research cases were likely to adopt one of a finite number of approaches to teaching history (question 1) or to include (or not) recent violent conflict in the curriculum (question 2). I adopted a more inductive approach to answering research question 3. Drawing on conceptual work developed by Bellino (2014a, 1), which clearly outlines “a range of approaches and social purposes for teaching the past,” I present a tentative typology of approaches to teaching about recent conflict that have emerged from the research reviewed. I also include a discussion of positive approaches and common challenges that emerged across the research. These were arrived at by noting the frequency of similar findings across studies in line with Sandelowski and Barroso (2007).

The review includes research on 11 countries: Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH;  $n = 6$ ), Cyprus (4), Guatemala (3), Israel/Palestine (7), Lebanon (2), Northern Ireland (5), Peru (2), Rwanda (9), South Africa (5), Sri Lanka (2), and Yemen (1). Given that a number of other countries have experienced conflict since 1990—the 2011 Education For All Global Monitoring Report, for instance, identified 32 conflict-affected countries—research in this area appears underdeveloped. The lamentation that EiE research concentrates on a few well-researched cases at the expense of others that remain largely uninvestigated (e.g., Human Security Report 2012) seems to apply here.

The state of research in this area calls for some further comments. Many studies rely on textbook analysis (e.g., Al Haj 2005; Bar Tal 1998; Paulson 2010b; Torsti 2007; Yogev 2012; Young 2010), although several combine that method with others (e.g., Oglesby 2007a; Paulson 2010a; Sanchez Meertens 2013; Staeheli and Stammer 2013; Torsti 2009). Studies often provide no further detail as to how textbook analysis was undertaken. The limits of textbook analysis as a research method have been convincingly argued and mean this approach tells us little about how history education actually happens for teachers and students (e.g., Worden 2014). Nonetheless, textbooks, especially those that are state issued, offer a window into the official national narrative and enable authors to explore the ways presentations of self and other have changed, or how conflict events are narrated. Other common research methods used in the studies reviewed include interviews (with experts, students, and teachers), small surveys (of teachers and students), observation, other ethnographic methods, and policy analysis.

Connected to the reliance on textbook analysis, research in this area does not give a clear or detailed picture of how decisions about curricular change are taken or of how (and if) consensus is reached about the narratives presented in textbooks. Exceptions include studies that connect politics and textbook development (e.g., Bekerman and Zembylas 2013; King 2010; Papadakis 2008; Paulson 2010a; Weldon 2010) and those that explore the composition of the bodies that make decisions about curriculum and textbooks (Al-Haj 2005; Sanchez Meertens 2013; Torsti 2009). Finally, having highlighted some weaknesses in research in this area, a major strength should be mentioned. Research in EiE has been criticized for being “detached from larger discussions on discourse and social change” (Sanchez Meertens 2013, 254), of relying on “problem-solving theory” (Novelli and Lopes Cardozo 2008), and of avoiding theory all together (Paulson and Rapleye 2007). By and large, the research reviewed here is theoretically grounded, and it is informed by and contributes to wider debates.



## A BACKGROUND TO HISTORY EDUCATION

A nationalist approach to teaching history has predominated since the rise of the nation state. This approach is concerned with instilling a linear narrative made up of key episodes and peopled by key figures, thereby creating a “natural” and distinct nation of which students can feel a part (Carretero 2011). While this approach to history education is certainly still in evidence, in recent years there has been considerable debate and change. Debates have centered around the purpose of history education and the kind of subject or citizen that it should produce.

From these debates (at least) three trends have emerged. First, as Bellino (2014a, 4) explains, the traditional purpose of history education as a transmitter of collective memory has shifted, at least in part, “from indoctrination to inspiration.” The linear master narrative persists, but it creates engaged rather than obedient citizens. It is assumed that the “right” narrative will be able to forge a shared identity across difference and will lead to desirable outcomes in terms of the civic dispositions and attitudes of young people. While history education still transmits a national narrative, this shift means that its pedagogy and inspiration expand to include more democratic teaching methods, a concern with social and economic history, and with the inclusion of marginalized histories.

Second, the single-narrative model of history education has been challenged by an approach grounded in the historical method. Under this “enquiry-based, multi-perspective approach” (McCully 2012, 146), students learn to understand history by developing the disciplinary skills of historians. They are encouraged to become comfortable with contradictory sources, alternative perspectives, and the constructed nature of historical knowledge. Along with developing historical knowledge, outcomes of the process include perspective-taking, independent thinking and evaluating primary and secondary evidence.

Finally, globalization has “de-nationalized” history education (Hansen 2012). In many education systems, history is no longer a subject taught in its own right; it is instead included in subjects like social studies or civics. This “social-sciencization” (Hymans in Cole 2007, 132) focuses on contemporary history and society more than on the nation state. National history, therefore, is often now taught alongside local, regional, and global history, thus expanding the notion of the community(ies) that students are to imagine themselves to be part of. Given these changes in history education as a subject, I first investigated which of the three approaches described above—national narrative, disciplinary, globalized—were evident in the cases reviewed.



## FINDINGS

### RESEARCH QUESTION 1: APPROACHING HISTORY EDUCATION

McCully (2012, 164) posits that there is “a prevailing view” among international agencies that the disciplinary approach offers the “most effective way for history teaching to contribute to postconflict understanding.” Within the research reviewed here, however, only Northern Ireland and Northern Cyprus have adopted this approach (Barton and McCully 2010, 2005; Kitson 2007; McCully 2012; Papadakis 2008). Northern Irish history curriculum uses “an enquiry-based approach to teaching, which enables pupils to engage with different perspectives” (Kitson 2007, 123). In Northern (Turkish) Cyprus, new history textbooks introduced in 2004 “follow a social-constructivist model of history, which presents nationalism and national identity as emerging under specific historical conditions rather than as given” (Papadakis 2008, 128) and encourages “students to develop critical thinking and multiperspectivity” (Latif 2010, 40).

In Rwanda’s primary education (King 2014) and in Guatemala (Bellino 2014b; Oglesby 2007b), Peru (Paulson 2010a, 2010b), South Africa (Staeheli and Stammer 2013; Weldon 2010), and Yemen (Young 2010), history education is included as part of a social studies syllabus. In this approach, history is one of the main orientations or disciplines from which students explore social scientific knowledge and/or citizenship formation. For instance, topics covered in Yemeni textbooks include “the age of discovery (e.g. the voyages of Magellan, Cook, Columbus, etc.); ancient civilizations in North and South America, Europe and Australia; Yemen under the Ottomans; and, Yemen’s 20th-century history” (Young 2010, 25). In South Africa, a social studies text moves from Nazi Germany, to the U.S. civil rights movement, to nuclear deterrence and the Cold War, and, finally, to apartheid in South Africa (Staeheli and Stammer 2013, 36).

In Bosnia-Herzegovina (Freedman et al. 2004a; Stabback 2004), Cyprus (Hadjiyanni 2008; Latif 2010), Lebanon (van Ommering 2014), Sri Lanka (Sanchez Meertens 2013), and Rwandan secondary education (King 2014), the predominant approach to history education remains a traditional one based on the instillation of a national narrative. While this approach in some instances (e.g. guidance for secondary history curriculum in Rwanda; King 2014) is closer to the “inspiration” model Bellino (2014a) describes, these narratives remain largely focused on creating “patriotic nationalists” (Carretero et al. 2011), as I explore in more detail below.

*Table 1: Approaches to History Education*

'Social-sciencization'	Guatemala Peru Rwanda (primary education) South Africa Yemen
Disciplinary approach	Northern (Turkish) Cyprus Northern Ireland
National narrative approach	Bosnia-Herzegovina Cyprus Rwanda (secondary education) Lebanon Sri Lanka

While I have characterized countries as taking a particular approach to history education, these are not watertight or necessarily mutually exclusive categories. For instance, Papadakis (2008) finds persistent ethnocentrism in the new, multiperspectival North Cypriot textbooks, despite their intentions. The South African textbooks described above, which are used in social studies classrooms, adopt a disciplinary approach to history, including “diverse histories . . . , space for ‘subjugated knowledges’ [and] community histories which had been silenced in the apartheid curriculum” (Weldon 2007, 85). In other contexts, the teaching about recent conflict that takes place in social studies classrooms relies on a single, often nationalist narrative, as is the case in Rwanda’s primary schools (King 2014). This suggests that, despite evidence of a “social sciencization” of history in the conflict-affected contexts discussed here, national narrative is still relied on to approach discussions of recent or ongoing conflict.

## **RESEARCH QUESTION 2: WHETHER (OR NOT) TO INCLUDE RECENT CONFLICT IN HISTORY EDUCATION**

Theorists who reflect on memory, history, violence, and education draw attention to the long-term horizon of these processes (e.g., Jelin 2003), suggesting that it is perhaps reasonable to expect that, for some time following a conflict and in instances of ongoing violence, these events will not be included in curricula. However, Cole (2007, 128) suggests that, as attention to education is increasingly incorporated into postconflict and peacebuilding interventions, “the time frame for examining the teaching of school history, or at least opening discussions about it, may be changing.” The studies reviewed here present a mixed picture, but they do not suggest that reformed curricula are incorporating conflict either quickly or easily.

*Table 2: Recent conflict within the national curriculum*

Guidance on recent conflict not included in national curriculum	Guatemala Lebanon Sri Lanka Bosnia-Herzegovina (no common curriculum) Northern Ireland (not within compulsory curriculum)
Guidance on recent conflict included in national curriculum	Cyprus Israel Peru Rwanda (after delay) South Africa (after delay) Yemen

The history of recent conflict is included in the curriculum in 6 of the 11 countries included in this study, albeit in some cases after considerable delay. In Rwanda, a moratorium on teaching history was initiated immediately after the 1994 genocide and has never been formally lifted, although “some important efforts have been made to reintroduce history into schools, raising a multitude of questions and much controversy” (King 2014, 130). These initiatives include curricular guidance for history teaching at the secondary level, in which “the war of 1990-1994 and the genocide of the Tutsi’ is scheduled to receive the most class time in comparison to other periods of Rwandan history” (135). Teaching history was also delayed in South Africa during the transition from apartheid (Weldon 2010). The first post-apartheid national curriculum, released in 1996, “avoided engaging with the traumatic past,” was “forward looking,” and did not include history as a taught subject (82-83). However, the revised curriculum, released in 2003, “was shaped by a democratic discourse which regarded history education as central to the development of moral and ethical values in young people,” and it includes instruction about the country’s apartheid past. In Cyprus (Latif 2010; Hadjiyanni 2008; Papadakis 2008), Israel (Al-Haj 2005; Gordon 2005; Yogev 2012), Peru (Paulson 2010a, 2010b), and Yemen (Young 2010), recent conflict is part of the required curriculum.

### SILENCE ABOUT RECENT CONFLICT

I have classified the somewhat special cases of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Northern Ireland as being silent about recent conflict as they do not have compulsory national curriculum content about recent conflict. In BiH, three parallel education systems and curricula persist, and while the historic roots of conflict are addressed in each, efforts to develop a common curriculum that would include the 1992-1995 conflict have failed (Ahonen 2013; Freedman et al. 2004a). Thus, “ethnic-nationalist education” (Stabback 2004) persists, and reform of the curric-

ula for the “national group subjects” of history, geography, language, literature, and religious instruction is resisted.

Recent conflict is also not addressed in Northern Ireland’s compulsory history curriculum (Barton and McCully 2005, 2010; Kitson 2007). History education is compulsory up to age 14, and the curriculum for this stage ends with the partition of Ireland in 1922 (Kitson 2007). “Difficult and contested issues” (127) connected with the history of conflict in Northern Ireland are included in study units, but with the 1922 cut-off point, the more recent history of “the Troubles” is not part of the compulsory curriculum. Research by Kitson (2007) and Barton and McCully (2005, 2010) problematizes the 1922 cut-off point and teaching approaches that do not encourage students to make connections between the past and present. Barton and McCully (2005, 108) find that students “do make such connections on their own” and that “without teacher mediation those connections are likely to be highly selective and uncritical.”

Recent and/or ongoing conflict is not addressed in the national curricula of Guatemala (Oglesby 2007a, 2007b), Lebanon (van Ommering 2014), or Sri Lanka (Sanchez Meertens 2013). In Guatemala, history has been “subsumed by social studies” (Oglesby 2007a, 184), and there are no national standards for teaching about history or about Guatemala’s 34-year civil war, which ended in 1996. Efforts by the ministry of education to introduce a textbook based on the work of the country’s truth commission were halted by the congress. The ministry of education did not adopt proposals from civil society organizations for “historical memory” studies within the social studies curriculum. Despite the lack of curricular guidance, Oglesby (2007, 185) reports that textbooks produced since the 1996 peace accords “address the conflict to some degree.” Bellino’s (2014b) ethnographic research finds some discussion of the country’s long conflict in schools, but argues that, in the absence of a formal and critical framework, preexisting social divisions are maintained, new fractures are created, and atrocities are mystified.

In Lebanon, the history textbook distributed by the state stops in 1943, the year Lebanon gained independence. It discusses “neither the decades of sectarian strife, nor Lebanon’s precarious position in the lingering ‘Middle East conflict,’ nor the hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees inhabiting shanty towns across the country” (van Ommering 2014, 2). Efforts to revise the history curriculum in the 1990s failed to “combine and balance divergent historical narratives” (Frayha 2004), although these efforts did succeed in introducing a common civics education curriculum. In the “vacuum” of official history, van Ommering’s (2014, 3-4) ethnographic work shows how personal and family experiences of war and “political movements that ensure constant reproduction of sectarian discourse and imagery” enable students to “display keen awareness of civil war events.” Yet students lack the knowledge and skills to interpret these events or place them in context.

In Sri Lanka, history education stops after 1979, thereby excluding a large segment of the country's post-independence history and most of the time in which it experienced systematic violence (Sanchez Meertens 2013). Key incidents of violence that took place prior to 1979 are not mentioned in the official history textbooks used in Sri Lanka, although there is brief mention of the "tragic ethnic conflict" in some citizenship education textbooks (258). Perera and colleagues (2004) explain that "painful collective memories and group animosities . . . stand in the way of reconceptualising or rewriting history as a school subject that could facilitate social cohesion." Sanchez Meertens (2013, 259) finds a "silent reproduction of conflict" in Sri Lanka's history education as "issues of identity, nationhood and the ancient past" are "fashioned in such a way [as] to legitimize a certain strand on ethnic relations and civil war," despite making no explicit mention of war.

The research reviewed suggests that closing history discussions before the advent of recent violent conflict does not benefit learners. Young people are aware of conflict going on around them and of the legacies of recent conflicts, as the ethnographic and interview-based research reviewed here demonstrates (e.g., Barton and McCully 2005, 2010; Bellino 2014b; Kitson 2007; Sanchez Meertens 2013; van Ommering 2014). Research highlights how young people develop (often partisan) narratives and identification with regard to recent conflict, despite its formal absence from the school curriculum. History education that deals explicitly with conflict might play a role in mediating this process by engaging with controversial material, promoting discussion, and giving students the skills to interpret and contextualize their encounters with the violent past outside the classroom. I turn now to an exploration of the cases where some attempt has been made to address recent conflict in history (or social studies) classrooms.

### **RESEARCH QUESTION 3: HOW IS THE RECENT VIOLENT PAST APPROACHED?**

In Cyprus, Israel, Peru, Rwanda, and South Africa, recent or ongoing conflict is included in the curriculum as a topic to be covered in either history (Cyprus, Israel, Rwandan secondary education) or social studies (Peru, South Africa, Rwanda primary education). In Guatemala, as mentioned above, there is no formal curricular guidance on teaching about the civil war, but it is included in leading social studies textbooks (Oglesby 2007a, 2007b).

*Table 3: Approaches to addressing recent conflict*

Exemplary memory	Guatemala Peru South Africa
Mythical unified past made official	Rwanda Yemen
Ethno-nationalist narratives	Bosnia-Herzegovina Cyprus Israel

Below I identify three distinct approaches employed to deal with recent conflict. These approaches have been developed inductively through my reading of the research collected in this review and supported by a wider reading of theoretical work in memory studies and history education. As mentioned above, Bellino's (2014a) theoretical work on history education following conflict has been invaluable for this analysis. Again, the approaches presented here are neither watertight nor mutually exclusive. On the whole, the research finds that history education is presented in problematic ways that are unlikely to contribute to peacebuilding and may in fact reinforce the dynamics of conflict. But, researchers do draw attention to some positive approaches, which are discussed at the end of this section.

### **“EXEMPLARY MEMORY,” CONFLICT AS EXCEPTION, AND HISTORY AS CITIZENSHIP**

In both Peru and Guatemala, where history is taught within social studies, recent violent conflict is presented alongside human rights and peace education. In Guatemala, “the inclusion of material on the war serves as a prelude to a much longer elaboration related to civic education and citizen formation” (Oglesby 2007b, 80). As Oglesby explains, history is presented in the Guatemalan textbooks as “exemplary memory” (Todorov in Oglesby 2007b, 80); the past is used “as a guide for action in the present and future.” While such an approach may have potential (e.g., see discussion in Bellino 2014a), Oglesby's research (2007b, 80, 92-93) highlights its limitations in Guatemala. Oglesby shows that conflict is presented as either “an exposé of brutality or as the triumph of democracy” and how victims of violence are “drained of their identities as historical protagonists.” The responsibility for conflict is attributed to a pervasive “culture of violence,” which is now to be replaced by “a culture of peace.” Oglesby explains that individuals are responsible for creating and maintaining this culture of peace in the same way they were responsible for the culture of violence, and as such they “must be instructed in new ‘peaceful’ ways of being and acting.” What is missing is a discussion of the structural causes of the conflict and the “histories of collective, contestatory politics” that demonstrate the agency of historical actors, including victims.

In Peru, recent conflict is part of the syllabus for social sciences in the final year of secondary school, housed within a discussion of “the second half of the twentieth century: Peru and the world” (Ministerio de Educacion del Peru in Paulson 2010a). Guidance is scant, stating only that teachers are expected to cover “subversive movements and peace processes in Peru” and “violence and internal conflict in contemporary Peru. Truth and Justice.” The approach taken in the textbook sanctioned by the ministry of education relies on a “two-fires confrontation” (140-42), similar to the “two devils” portrayed in Guatemalan textbooks (Bellino 2014b), that places innocent and helpless victims between “fanatical terrorists and a Peruvian armed forces operating under now non-existent and never-to-be-replicated conditions.” This approach, much like the Guatemalan case, fails to acknowledge the ways victims of conflict also “negotiated, tolerated, collaborated with and resisted the daily presence of armed insurgents and state forces” (Paulson 2010a, 140). Furthermore, it creates an explanation of conflict as exceptional and disconnected from the structural inequalities and racism that other historical accounts, including Peru’s truth commission, identify as causes of the conflict in Peru, and that persist into the present.

History education in South Africa is part of “a values-driven curriculum” (Weldon 2010, 84-85) and is “meant to be primarily citizenship education.” As Weldon (85) describes, the dilemmas this orientation raises “in terms of the nature and purpose of history” were resolved by using an enquiry approach to history education, which locates “history for democracy within the skills and processes of sound history education.” In practice, however, Staeheli and Hammett (2013, 37-39) find that “calls to human rights and the attempt to make universal rights the core of South African citizenship” predominate over investigations into the country’s apartheid past. They explain that textbooks “address that history in very matter-of-fact and decidedly apolitical tones and without dwelling on the pain and injustice of the system.” Despite South Africa’s particular history, the “ideal citizen” promoted by the curriculum is universal. South Africa’s young citizens are meant to be self-sufficient, economically productive, and to make few demands on the state despite the continued “social and spatial segregation and profound inequalities” that constrain or enable young people’s opportunities.

These three countries have in common an attempt to make the recent violent past “usable” (Wertsch 2002, 70) for the present day, with “relevant lessons that transcend historical contexts” (Bellino 2014a, 6). As Bellino (6-7) explains, making the past usable for present and future nation-building and “civic connectedness” involves “shaping history curriculum around a nation’s ‘best’ story.” In these cases, the “best story” assumes peace as a status quo against which the politics of conflict and injustice do not bear telling. At stake here, as the cases above indicate, are historical accuracy and depth, but also something more. History education about recent conflict, as described in the research outlined in this section, does not engage substantively with the causes of conflict, with past injustices, or with



the ways that both move into the present. Indeed, conflict is presented as an exceptional moment, an aberration overcome by the present: democracy, active citizenship, and a culture of peace. Whether these forward-looking, democratically oriented narratives will succeed in inspiring young people in Guatemala, Peru, or South Africa, where injustices and inequalities tied to past conflict persist, remains an open question.

### A MYTHICAL UNIFIED PAST MADE OFFICIAL

In Rwanda, there is a “stark difference” (King 2014, 137) between curricular guidance and educational initiatives that encourage critical thinking, active discussion and questioning, and “the reality of a singular univocal narrative” about the country’s history and the 1994 genocide. A strong “official historical narrative” (Freedman et al. 2008, 674) has been created by the post-genocide Rwandan Patriotic Front government, which is disseminated in schools, at genocide memorials, local *gacaca* justice processes, and Ingando “reeducation camps” (Buckley-Zistel 2009; Kearney 2011; King 2010). This narrative begins in precolonial times, when “Rwandans were a peaceful people who lived together in harmony,” and it “claims that colonials invented ethnicity” (Freedman et al. 2008, 675). Rwanda’s 1994 genocide and the civil war are explained within this narrative as the divisive use and manipulation of ethnicity, a legacy of colonial rule (Weinstein et al. 2007). The “myth of an idealized early life of ethnic unity” (63) also presents the vision to which post-genocide Rwanda will now return. The necessity of unity is used to justify the current situation in which discussion of ethnicity is prohibited (Kearney 2011; King 2014, 2010) and “many Rwandans experience censorship and self-censorship, and fear being charged with vague offenses of ‘divisionism’ and ‘genocide ideology’” (King 2010, 300-01).

King (2014, 137) shows how this “oversimplified ‘correct’ narrative” is reflected in primary civics and social studies initiatives, in secondary history guidelines, and even, to a degree, in a collaborative international project that was eventually halted by government (e.g., Freedman et al., 2008). Researchers highlight a number of problems with Rwanda’s “one history” (137) approach. They first point to inconsistencies between the Rwandan government’s narrative and the historical record (Buckley-Zistel 2009; Freedman et al., 2011, 2008, 2004b; King 2014), which raise questions about its legitimacy as history education. Second, the strict imposition of a single narrative and the exclusion of any and all alternatives contradicts another goal of postconflict education reform in Rwanda, namely, to embrace “so-called modern democratic teaching methods that foster skills . . . such as critical thinking and debate” (Freedman et al. 2008, 664). These intentions, apparent in written texts, remain “divorced from implementation and context” (King 2014, 137). Third, the use of this narrative to justify the outlawing of public ethnic

identification ignores the fact that ethnicity remains “a salient category for many Rwandans” (King 2010, 296). Finally, researchers consider the implications for reconciliation, democracy, and peacebuilding. King (2010, 294) shows how the official narrative “selectively highlights some civilian memories of violence, and represses others.” While this selectivity works to legitimate the current government’s rule, it fails to “address and challenge the social cleavages and exclusions that characterized Rwanda’s past and may be, moreover, fostering exclusions and social cleavages in the present” (303-04).

In Yemen, too, Young (2010, 28-29) finds a “national narrative being promulgated by the government [that] . . . does not map perfectly onto the actual historical events.” Young’s textbook analysis finds a narrative premised on “Yemen’s ancient origins and its inherent unity” (29). Textbooks start Yemeni history approximately 3,000 years ago and use ancient empires to make “primordial claims about the nature of Yemeni people and nation,” and to suggest “that the modern Yemeni government and the Yemeni citizens are successors of these states and peoples” (26-28). The period from the mid-1960s to 1990, when the Yemen Arab Republic and the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen existed as two separate states, is mentioned in textbooks. However, “they do not actually describe the two states . . . and their nearly thirty years of independent existence prior to unification” (27-28). The two-state period, border wars that occurred during that time, and the political processes involved in unification are not discussed. Instead, the “the will of the people that, despite long years apart, the country be ‘reunified’” is emphasized. Yemen’s 1994 civil war is mentioned as a brief threat to “our precious unity” led by “secessionist traitors”; “nuanced discussion of the root causes” are not discussed (28). Furthermore, the ongoing tensions in north and south Yemen do not feature within the national unity narrative.

In both Yemen and Rwanda, a “top-down” (Buckley-Zistel 2009) official narrative based on a mythical ancient unity has been a key tool of governments, which are described as increasingly authoritarian (King 2010; Young 2009). In these cases, this tendency of government might help to explain the more traditional “indoctrination” approach to transmitting a national narrative. On top of concerns about the “truth” of these official narratives, they do not open the reconciliatory potential of history education, which, it has been argued (e.g., Cole 2007), rests at least in part in enabling dialogue and the productive confrontation of difference.

### **ETHNO-NATIONALIST NARRATIVES AND EFFORTS TO CHANGE THEM**

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cyprus, and Israel/Palestine, research highlights the persistence of distinctive “ethnic nationalist narratives” (Papadakis 2008, 131) that are linked to and maintained by particular identity communities. These narratives construct strong in- and out-group identities (e.g., Torsti 2009) and legitimize

victimhood and supremacy (e.g., Bar-Tal 1998). They emphasize the “natural” claims of the in-group—for instance, as Latif (2010, 34) writes, “the conflicting historical narratives of each community take for granted that Cyprus ‘belongs’ to them on historical grounds.” They are histories “from above” that are political rather than social. In the case of Cyprus, Papadakis (2008, 137) describes how in both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot historical narratives “war is so pervasive that it emerges as the motor of history to the point where it becomes naturalized as an inescapable characteristic of humans.” In BiH, where Bosnian Croat, Bosnian Serb, and Bosniak Muslim students study separate curricula, Torsti (2007, 77) found that, even after the required withdrawal of potentially offensive material, “the members of other national groups in the country are typically presented through enemy images.”

In all three cases, efforts have been made to question and counter these narratives, including by revising textbooks. As mentioned above, formal efforts to develop a harmonized curriculum in BiH have failed, although informal initiatives continue. A “complete change of history books” (Papadakis 2008, 137) followed political change in Northern (Turkish) Cyprus, with new textbooks introduced in 2004. The books approach “nation, nationalism and identity” differently from earlier texts, by focusing on Cyprus (rather than Turkey), presenting nationalism as largely negative, and avoiding essentialist presentations of ethnic groups (Papadakis 2008, 138–39). History, Papadakis explains (139), “is no longer presented as a monolithic story of conflict; instead, conscious emphasis is placed on examples of coexistence and cooperation.” Papadakis (143) finds several “general weaknesses” in the new textbooks, including a lingering ethnocentrism, and he raises fascinating questions about the approach they take to history education. He shows how the textbooks have abandoned the narrative form, “that is of history as the story of the nation,” and therefore the “notion that history has a single meaning” or is “primarily a moral story.” This means that “no single meaning or lesson . . . can now be derived from history as presented in the new Turkish Cypriot books,” a markedly different approach from the idea of history as “exemplary memory.”

In Israel, new history textbooks were produced in the wake of the 1993 Oslo Agreement, with the aim of opening both the goals and the content of the history curriculum to align with the political environment of “conflict resolution and dialogue” (Al Haj 2005, 54). While Al Haj (47) finds the new textbooks “more open and complex” than earlier books, his analysis still finds a single ethno-national narrative that “safeguards national Zionist values [and] . . . leaves no room for dealing with the legitimacy of the Palestinian narrative.”

Zembylas and Bekerman’s (2013, 165) work is useful in considering these cases where ethno-nationalist narratives appear both pervasive and resistant to change, both as diagnostic and as suggestive of positive potential. Drawing on decades of research on peace education in Israel and Cyprus, the authors remind us

of the role of the nation state in shaping possibilities (or lack thereof) for challenging and changing dominant narratives. In contexts where such possibilities are limited, they suggest that students and teachers take advantage of small openings for change and, where possible, allow space for “dangerous memories” to disturb taken-for-granted emotions and present identity as something other than static and essentialized.

### **BEYOND THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS: POSITIVE APPROACHES AND COMMON CHALLENGES**

I conclude my discussion of the findings of this review by highlighting the following positive approaches that emerged from the research, which demonstrate how history education might contribute to peacebuilding and reconciliation. To date, none of the approaches described below have been implemented comprehensively across an education system as “the” approach to teaching the history of recent violent conflict. That they were frequently identified in the research as promising suggests that perhaps they should be considered more comprehensively.

### **TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE**

Conceptual research argues that transitional justice and history education reform could be more closely connected, noting the particular pedagogic value of the truth commission process (e.g., Cole 2007; Oglesby 2007; Paulson 2009). Truth commission reports have provided source material for official textbooks and alternative educational materials developed by human rights organizations in Guatemala (Oglesby 2007a, 2007b), South Africa (Weldon 2010), and Peru (Paulson 2010a, 2010b).<sup>2</sup> However, using the historical narratives of conflict that truth commissions construct has not been without problems. In Peru, for instance, relying on the truth commission’s report as the only source for textbook content about recent conflict promoted a politicized debate about the legitimacy of the truth commission process as a whole (Paulson 2010a). Nonetheless, more intentional collaboration between educators and transitional justice actors has considerable potential. The backward looking, truth-telling, and justice-oriented principles of transitional justice open up possibilities for the education sector to consider its own legacy in perpetuating and contributing to conflict (through curriculum and otherwise), while the future-oriented nature of education creates opportunities for transitional justice outcomes to be shared, debated, and understood.

---

<sup>2</sup> In Sierra Leone, a children’s version of the truth commission report was produced by UNICEF, but it has not been widely used in schools (Paulson 2006).

### **FACING HISTORY AND OURSELVES**

Research on Northern Ireland (Murphy and Gallagher 2009), South Africa (Weldon 2010, 2007), and Rwanda (Freedman et al. 2008) describes fruitful collaboration between the U.S.-based organization, Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO), and education actors leading history curriculum reform. FHAO has developed an approach that “helps teachers and their students make the essential connections between history and the moral choices they confront in their own lives” (Murphy and Gallagher 2009, 7). Researchers report positively on this work wherever collaborations with FHAO are discussed, especially as the FHAO workshops provide opportunities for teachers to discuss and grapple with their own experiences of conflict.

### **COMMON TEXTBOOKS**

Korostelina and Lassig (2013) collect cases of collaborative history textbook projects in Europe, the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Far East, and the Middle East. These are sometimes efforts between nations, such as efforts to develop a Franco-German textbook, a German-Polish textbook, and a Chinese-Japanese-South Korean textbook. In other cases, divided groups seek to develop a textbook together, such as the work of the “learn each other’s historical narrative” in Israel/Palestine (Rohde 2013). Although difficult and often unsuccessful, these processes are potentially reconciliatory in themselves. That such efforts now appear to be becoming more common may be linked to the “de-nationalizing” of history. Attention to these processes and outcomes is certainly merited, given, of course, the usual cautions around the value of textbooks and textbook research.

In addition to these positive approaches, a number of challenges were present across studies reviewed, which are presented below. These challenges highlight the impact of wider decisions about educational priorities and organization in postconflict contexts on the possibilities for curriculum to contribute to building peace and fostering reconciliation.

### **TEACHERS: PEDAGOGY, TRAINING, AND IDENTITY**

Cole and Barsalou (2006, 10) suggest that “pedagogy—the way history is taught—should take priority in many contexts over curriculum revision” (original emphasis). The concern that pedagogy emphasizes rote learning, uncritical thinking, and is unquestioning of authority in many conflict-affected contexts (e.g., Davies, 2004) was borne out in some studies. In Lebanon, for instance, van Ommering (2014, 1) describes “static” history lessons where students memorize

facts for a test and forget them the next day. One student told him history was “way too boring . . . just useless!”

Research reviewed here also emphasizes that teachers’ own identities and experiences of conflict have an impact on their capacity and willingness to teach about recent conflict. Rwanda’s post-genocide teaching force includes teachers accused of committing genocide crimes, returnees who have spent long periods abroad, and un- and underqualified teachers, all of whom are expected to “become positive agents of change” (King 2014, 145). Teachers’ own attitudes and narratives may reflect personal trauma and/or a conflict-perpetuating discourse, which they bring into the classroom (e.g., Bekerman and Zembylas 2011; Weldon 2010). In Guatemala, indigenous teachers’ own historical memory often made them more willing or more capable of engaging students in discussion of the recent conflict than their urban counterparts (Bellino 2014b).

Given these identity and capacity issues, teacher training is a regular recommendation of research in this area. The lack of pedagogic training among teachers in Lebanon meant they were unprepared to “manage, contain or solve conflicts in the classroom,” making it easier “to simply ban sensitive issues from being raised” (Bellino 2014b, 5). Bellino’s research in Guatemala found teachers who believed in the importance of teaching about conflict but felt unprepared in terms of training and materials. In Rwanda, Freedman and colleagues (2008, 665) found that “educators may inhibit disagreements—including potentially productive ones—for fear of their erupting into larger and more destructive conflicts.” Gordon (2005, 369) reports that teachers in Israeli schools who serve students who have lost family members in terrorist attacks have abandoned sections of the new textbooks that “for some of these families . . . are too liberal” after “angry parental responses.” Elsewhere, however, research finds teachers with more agency and capacity. Kitson’s (2007) work in Northern Ireland, for example, found many teachers tackling controversial issues and making connections between past and present, although she found that those in conflict “hot spots” were less likely to do so. In Cyprus, Turkish Cypriot teachers worked with academics to create the new textbooks discussed above, and the teachers unions were very active in promoting the new curriculum (Latif 2010; Papadakis 2008;).

### SEGREGATED LEARNERS

In a majority of the conflict-affected contexts explored in this review, learners are segregated. In Bosnia-Herzegovina (Freedman et al., 2004a; Stabback 2004; Torsti 2009), Cyprus (Latif 2008), and Israel/Palestine (Al-Haj 2005), learners are physically segregated and study separate curricula. Elsewhere, although they share the same curriculum, learners from different groups tend to study apart from one another. In Lebanon (Frayha 2004; van Ommering 2014), Northern Ire-

land (Barton and McCully 2010, 2005; Kitson 2007), South Africa (Staeheli and Hammett 2013), and Sri Lanka (Sanchez Meertens 2013), students remain largely segregated by religious community, social class, language, geography, or ethnicity. In Northern Ireland, for instance, only around 5 percent of students attend integrated Protestant-Catholic schools (Kitson 2007); in Lebanon, three-quarters of students study in private, faith-based schools (Frayha 2004; van Ommering 2014). The degree to which segregation continues to structure the educational experiences of learners in the conflict-affected regions included in this review is striking. It is certainly questionable whether the “ideal that youth can heal social divisions” (Staeheli and Stammer 2013, 33) is best served by keeping them separated from one another, especially given Hart’s (2011) reminder that the lived experience of young people is likely to trump the intended educational experience when these two are mismatched.

### **CONTROVERSY, PROTEST, AND POLITICAL BACKLASH**

In a number of cases, efforts to revise or reform history curricula have met with controversy, protest, or political backlash. For instance, in Guatemala (Oglesby 2007a) and in Peru (Paulson 2010a), representatives of congress and of the armed forces objected to content that acknowledged human rights violations by the state. In the Peru the use of textbooks was briefly suspended after a congresswoman claimed they amounted to an “apology for terrorism” (Paulson 2010a). Efforts to revise the history curriculum in Lebanon also have been thwarted, first by “vehement criticism from politicians” and most recently by student protests (van Ommering 2014). In BiH, formal efforts to harmonize history textbooks met with similar protests (Ahonen 2013; Freedman et al. 2004a, 20).

### **CONCLUSION**

In her work on teaching history in Israel, Yogevev (2012, 173) writes of “teaching the past in the present tense” and of the dilemmas of an “active past.” This sense of recent conflict as active comes through not just in cases of ongoing conflict but also in situations considered to be postconflict. The causes and legacies of conflict, and family and community memories, enter classrooms and shape education as an institution. Some conceptual work on educating about recent conflict takes the implications of an active past as a starting point. For instance, Jansen’s (2009) “postconflict pedagogy” casts perpetrators of violence as “victims of their own history” and uses an “epistemology of empathy” as a starting point for educational experiences that engage with conflict. Minow (1998) and others (see Bellino 2014a) argue for an approach that engages with historical injustices and with the process of transition itself in order to create a “new story,” a “myth of the refounding” (Osiel in Bellino 2014a, 8), as the basis



for a new collective memory. Papadakis (2008, 143), in contrast, sees potential in the “abandonment of the narrative form” that a social-constructivist approach enables. Here the notion of a holding onto a single moral or lesson is abandoned, freeing the future from a sense of historical determinism and leaving it open to be shaped by the political choices of young people. Bellino (2014a) recommends the development of a “historical consciousness” as the goal for history education about conflict. The teaching method would blend the critical historical practice of the disciplinary approach with the “inspired” collective memory approach, which aims to foster connectedness and social engagement.

None of these more active approaches to the past have shaped the overall experience of history education in the cases reviewed here, although researchers point to windows of opportunity, such as closer links with transitional justice processes and joint textbook initiatives. On the whole, this review finds a reliance on a traditional collective memory approach to disseminating national narratives, although this often occurs in social studies rather than history classrooms. The review shows that, in many cases, these narratives are top-down and ethno-nationalist, and they rely on devices like mythical past unity and the exceptionalism of conflict. I also find that histories of recent and ongoing conflicts are present in the educational experiences of young people, whether supported by formal curriculum or not. Taken together, these findings urge those undertaking curriculum reform to attend to recent conflicts as active and to consider approaches that will enable teachers and young people to confront this active past sensitively and meaningfully. The review findings suggest that for history education to contribute to peacebuilding and reconciliation it must engage seriously with the root causes of conflict and, crucially, with the ways they persist and are reconfigured in the present, and in students’ lived experiences. The impact of wider postconflict politics and decision making—including around how education is organized and the support provided for teacher training—on curricular initiatives’ potential to contribute to peacebuilding is also made clear by the research reviewed.

This review contributes to the (small but) growing EiE literature that explores curricular change in conflict-affected contexts, and highlights the need for further research and reflective practice in this area. Early EiE research has been crucial in grounding the field by exploring the links and the direction of the relationship between education and conflict. The growing recognition of the importance of education in the aftermath of conflict that EiE has succeeded in achieving also sets an agenda for research into the practice that this acknowledgement engenders. In this article, I have looked systematically at research into one element of this practice—history education about recent and ongoing conflict—in order to explore trends and highlight both potential and challenges. Similar studies of other elements of EiE practice may help to develop a fuller picture of the decision making, dilemmas, and outcomes of delivering education in conflict-affected contexts, including how EiE practice can avoid perpetuating conflict dynamics and contribute most effectively to peacebuilding and reconciliation.

## APPENDIX

	Author(s)	Year	Country(ies) covered	Type of resource	Analysis						
					Approach to history education			Recent conflict in curriculum?		Approach to teaching recent conflict	Issues / Positive avenues
					Social Studies	Disciplinary	National narrative	Yes	No		
1	Ahonen	2013	Bosnia-Herzegovina Finland South Africa	Journal article				X (SA)	X (BiH)		Controversy (BiH)
2	Al-Haj	2005	Israel	Journal article				X			Segregation
3	Bar-Tal	1998	Israel	Journal article			X			Ethnic nationalist narrative; legitimization of victimhood / supremacy	Segregation
4	Barton and McCully	2010	Northern Ireland	Journal article		X			X		Segregation
5	Barton and McCully	2005	Northern Ireland	Journal article		X			X		Segregation
6	Bekerman and Zembylas	2011	Cyprus Israel	Book							Teachers
7	Bellino	2014	Guatemala	Book chapter	X				X	Two devils; culture of violence/peace	Transitional justice Controversy Teachers
8	Buckley-Zistel	2009	Rwanda	Journal article			X		X	Top-down, 'official' narrative	
9	Feldt	2008	Israel/Palestine	Journal article					X		
10	Frayha	2004	Lebanon	Book chapter							Segregation
11	Freedman et al.	2011	Rwanda	Book chapter			X		X	Mythical unity	Teachers
12	Freedman et al.	2008	Rwanda	Journal article			X		X	Inconsistencies with historical record	FHAO Teachers
13	Freedman et al.	2004	Bosnia-Herzegovina Croatia	Book chapter	X				X		Segregation Controversy
14	Freedman et al.	2004	Rwanda	Book chapter					X	Mythical unity	
15	Gordon	2005	Israel	Journal article				X			Teachers
16	Hadjiyanni	2008	Cyprus	Book			X	X			
17	Kearney	2011	Rwanda	Book chapter						History rewritten; political expedience	Controversy
18	King	2014	Rwanda	Book	X (primary)	X (FHAO resources)	X (secondary history)	X		'Inspired' guidance; stark contrast to imposed official narrative	Teachers FHAO Controversy
19	King	2010	Rwanda	Journal article	X				X	Selective national narrative; repressive regime	

20	Kitson	2007	Northern Ireland	Book chapter		X		X		Teachers Segregation
21	Latif	2010	Cyprus	Journal article		X		X	Ethnic nationalist narrative; 'taken for-grantedness'	Teachers Segregation
22	McCully	2012	Northern Ireland	Journal article		X				Teachers Segregation
23	Murphy and Gallagher	2009	Northern Ireland	Journal article		X				FHAO
24	Oglesby	2007a	Guatemala	Book chapter	X			X	Exemplary memory	Transitional justice Controversy
25	Oglesby	2007b	Guatemala	Journal article	X			X	Exemplary memory	Transitional justice
26	Paulson	2010a	Peru	Journal article	X			X	Exemplary memory	Transitional justice Controversy
27	Paulson	2010b	Peru	Book chapter	X			X	Exemplary memory	Transitional justice
28	Papadakis	2008	Cyprus	Journal article		X		X	Ethnic nationalist narrative	Teachers
29	Perera et al.	2004	Sri Lanka	Book chapter			X	X	Ethnic nationalist narrative	
30	Rohde	2013	Israel/Palestine	Book chapter						Common textbooks
31	Sanchez Meertens	2013	Sri Lanka	Journal article			X	X	Ethnic nationalist narrative	Teachers Segregation
32	Stabback	2004	Bosnia-Herzegovina	Book chapter			X		"Ethnic nationalist education"	Segregation
33	Staeheli and Hammett	2013	South Africa	Journal article	X				Apolitical, universalized history	Teachers Segregation
34	Torsti	2009	Bosnia-Herzegovina	Journal article			X		Ethnic nationalist narrative, strong in and out group identities	Segregation
35	Torsti	2007	Bosnia-Herzegovina	Journal article					'Enemy imagery' to present 'other'	
36	van Ommering	2014	Lebanon	Journal article			X	X	Ethnic narrative / othering	Teachers Segregation Controversy
37	Weinstein et al.	2007	Croatia Kosovo Bosnia-Herzegovina Rwanda	Journal article			X (Rwanda / BiH)		Mythical unity	
38	Weldon	2010	South Africa	Journal article				X	Values-driven, citizenship focused curriculum	Transitional justice Teachers
39	Weldon	2007	South Africa	Report						Teachers FHAO
40	Weldon	2003	Rwanda South Africa	Journal article						Teachers FHAO
41	Young	2010	Yemen	Journal article	X			X	Mythical unity state promoted narrative	
42	Yogev	2012	Israel	Journal article				X	Ethnic nationalist narrative	Teachers

NOTES: Countries in *italics* excluded from analysis due to a) insufficient coverage or b) conflict ending earlier than 1990.

## REFERENCES

- Ahonen, Sirkka. 2013. "Postconflict History Education in Finland, South Africa and Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Nordidactica: Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education* 1: 90–103.
- Al-Haj, Majid. 2005. "National Ethos, Multicultural Education and the New History Textbooks in Israel." *Curriculum Inquiry* 35 (1): 47–72.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. London: Verso.
- Barnett-Page, Elaine, and James Thomas. 2009. "Methods for the Synthesis of Qualitative Research: A Critical Review." *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 9 (59). <http://www.biomedcentral.com/content/pdf/1471-2288-9-59.pdf>.
- Bar-Tal, Daniel. 1998. "The Rocky Road toward Peace: Beliefs on Conflict in Israeli Textbooks." *Journal of Peace Research* 35 (6): 723–42.
- Barton, Keith C., and Alan W. McCully. 2005. "History, Identity and the School Curriculum in Northern Ireland: An Empirical Study of Secondary Students' Ideas and Perspectives." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 37 (1): 85–116.
- Barton, Keith C., and Alan W. McCully. 2010. "You Can Form Your Own Point of View": Internally Persuasive Discourse in Northern Ireland Students' Encounters with History." *Teachers College Record* 112 (1): 142–81.
- Bekerman, Zvi, and Michalinos Zembylas. 2011. *Teaching Contested Narratives: Identity, Memory and Reconciliation in Peace Education and Beyond*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bellino, Michelle J. 2014a. "What Kind of History, for What Kind of Citizen?" Excerpted from *Memory in Transition: Historical Consciousness and Civic Attitudes among Youth in "Postwar" Guatemala*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Bellino, Michelle J. 2014b. "Whose Past, Whose Present? Historical Memory among the 'Postwar' Generation in Guatemala." In (Re) *Constructing Memory: School Textbooks and the Imagination of the Nation*, edited by James H. Williams, 131–53. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Buckland, Peter. 2005. *Reshaping the Future: Education and Postconflict Reconstruction*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Buckley-Zistel, Susanne. 2009. "Nation, Narration, Unification? The Politics of History Teaching After the Rwandan Genocide." *Journal of Genocide Research* 11 (1): 31–53.

- Burde, Dana, Amy Kapit, Rachel Wahl, Ozen Guven, and Margot Skarpeteig. 2013. "Education in Emergencies: A Review of Theory and Research." New Orleans: Comparative and International Education Society.
- Burde, Dana, and Leigh L. Linden. 2013. "Bringing Education to Afghan Girls: A Randomized Controlled Trial of Village-Based Schools." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 5 (3): 27–40.
- Carretero, Mario. 2011. *Constructing Patriotism: Teaching History and Memories in Global Worlds*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Carretero, Mario, Maria Rodriguez-Moneo, and Mikel Asensio. 2012. "History Education and the Construction of National Identity." In *History Education and the Construction of National Identities*, edited by Mario Carretero, Mikel Asensio, and Maria Rodriguez-Moneo, 1–16. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Cole, Elizabeth A. 2007. "Transitional Justice and the Reform of History Education." *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 1: 115–37.
- Cole, Elizabeth A., and Judy Barsalou. 2006. "Unite or Divide? The Challenges of Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Violent Conflict." Special Report, United States Institute of Peace, Washington, DC. <http://www.mafhoum.com/press9/281C32.pdf>.
- Davies, Lynn. 2004. *Education and Conflict: Complexity and Chaos*. London: Routledge and Falmer.
- Education For All. 2011. *The Hidden Crisis: Armed Conflict and Education* [Global Monitoring Report]. Paris: UNESCO.
- Frayha, Nemer. 2004. "Developing Curriculum as a Means to Bridging National Divisions in Lebanon." In *Education, Conflict and Social Cohesion*, edited by Sobhi Tawil and Alexandra Harley, 159–206. Geneva: UNESCO International Bureau for Education.
- Freedman, Sarah Warshauer, Dinka Corkalo, Naomi Levy, Dino Abazovic, Bronwyn Leebaw, Dean Ajdukovic, Dino Djipa, and Harvey M. Weinstein. 2004a. "Public Education and Social Reconstruction in Bosnia Herzegovina and Croatia." In *My Neighbour, My Enemy: Justice and Community in the Aftermath of Mass Atrocity*, edited by Eric Stover and Harvey M. Weinstein, 226–48. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Freedman, Sarah Warshauer, Deo Kambanda, Beth Lewis Samuelson, Innocent Mugisha, Immaculee Mukashema, Evode Mukama, Jean Mutabaruka, Harvey M. Weinstein, and Timothy Longmana. 2004b. "Confronting the Past in Rwandan Schools." In *My Neighbour, My Enemy: Justice and Community in the Aftermath of Mass Atrocity*, edited by Eric Stover and Harvey M. Weinstein, 248–67. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Freedman, Sarah Warshauer, Harvey M. Weinstein, Karen Murphy, and Timothy Longman. 2008. "Teaching History after Identity-Based Conflicts: The Rwanda Experience." *Comparative Education Review* 52 (4): 663–90.
- Freedman, Sarah Warshauer, Harvey M. Weinstein, Karen Murphy, and Timothy Longman. 2011. "Teaching History in Post-Genocide Rwanda." In *Remaking Rwanda: State Building and Human Rights after Mass Violence*, edited by Scott Straus and Lars Waldorf, 297–315. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Gordon, David. 2005. "History Textbooks, Narratives, and Democracy: A Response to Majid Al-Haj." *Curriculum Inquiry* 35 (3): 367–76.
- Gough, David, James Thomas, and Sandy Oliver. 2012. "Clarifying Differences between Review Designs and Methods." *Systematic Reviews* 1 (28): 1–9. <http://www.systematicreviewsjournal.com/content/pdf/2046-4053-1-28.pdf>.
- Hadjiyanni, Marina. 2008. *Constructing the Past, Constructing the Future: A Comparative Study of the Cyprus Conflict in Secondary History Education*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag.
- Hansen, Jonathan M. 2012. "De-Nationalize History and What Have We Done? Ontology, Essentialism, and the Search for a Cosmopolitan Alternative." In *History Education and the Construction of National Identities*, edited by Mario Carretero, Mikel Asensio, and Maria Rodriguez-Moneo, 17–32. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Hart, Jason. 2011. "Young People and Conflict: The Implications for Education." In *Education and Reconciliation: Exploring Conflict and Postconflict Situations*, edited by Julia Paulson. London: Bloomsbury.
- Human Security Report Project. 2012. *Human Security Report 2012: Sexual Violence, Education and War. Beyond the Mainstream Narrative*. Vancouver: Human Security Press.
- INEE (Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies). 2010a. *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*. 2nd ed. New York: INEE. [http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1012/INEE\\_GuideBook\\_EN\\_2012%20LoRes.pdf](http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1012/INEE_GuideBook_EN_2012%20LoRes.pdf).
- INEE. 2010b. *Guidance Notes on Teaching and Learning*. New York: INEE. [http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1004/Guidance\\_Notes\\_on\\_Teaching\\_and\\_Learning\\_EN.pdf](http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1004/Guidance_Notes_on_Teaching_and_Learning_EN.pdf).
- Jansen, Jonathan. 2009. *Knowledge in the Blood: Confronting Race and the Apartheid Past*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Jelin, Elizabeth. 2003. *State Repression and the Labors of Memory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Kearney, James. 2011. "A Unified Rwanda? Ethnicity, History and Reconciliation in the *Ingando* Peace and Solidarity Camp." In *Education and Reconciliation: Exploring Conflict and Postconflict Situations*, edited by Julia Paulson, 151–76. London: Continuum.
- King, Elisabeth. 2010. "Memory Controversies in Post-Genocide Rwanda: Implications for Peacebuilding." *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 5 (3): 293–309.
- King, Elisabeth. 2014. *From Classrooms to Conflict in Rwanda*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kitson, Alison. 2007. "History Teaching and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland." In *Teaching the Violent Past: History Education and Reconciliation*, edited by Elizabeth A. Cole, 123–55. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Korostelina, Karina, and Simone Lassig, eds. 2013. *History Education and Postconflict Reconciliation: Reconsidering Joint Textbook Projects*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Latif, Dilek. 2010. "Dilemmas of Moving from the Divided Past to Envisaged United Future: Rewriting the History Books in the North Cyprus." *International Journal for Education Law and Policy* [Special Issue]: 33–43.
- McCully, Alan W. 2012. "History Teaching, Conflict and the Legacy of the Past." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 7 (2): 145–59.
- Murphy, Karen, and Tony Gallagher. 2009. "Reconstruction After Violence: How Teachers and Schools Can Deal with the Legacy of the Past." *Perspectives in Education* 27 (2): 158–68.
- Minow, Martha L. 1998. *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Novelli, Mario, and Mieke T. A. Lopes Cardozo. 2008. "Conflict, Education and the Global South: New Critical Directions." *International Journal of Educational Development* 28: 472–88.
- Oglesby, Elizabeth. 2007a. "Historical Memory and the Limits of Peace Education: Examining Guatemala's *Memory of Silence* and the Politics of Curriculum Design." In *Teaching the Violent Past: History Education and Reconciliation*, edited by Elizabeth A. Cole, 175–205. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Oglesby, Elizabeth. 2007b. "Education Citizens in Postwar Guatemala: Historical Memory, Genocide and the Culture of Peace." *Radical History Review* 97: 77–98.
- Papadakis, Yiannis. 2008. "Narrative, Memory and History Education in Divided Cyprus: A Comparison of Schoolbooks on the 'History of Cyprus.'" *History and Memory* 20 (2): 128–48.



- Paulson, Julia. 2006. "The Educational Recommendations of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions: Potential and Practice in Sierra Leone." *Research in Comparative and International Education* 1 (4): 335–50.
- Paulson, Julia. 2009. "(Re)Creating Education in Postconflict Contexts: Transitional Justice, Education and Human Development." New York: International Centre for Transitional Justice, Research Unit. <http://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ-Development-Education-FullPaper-2009-English.pdf>.
- Paulson, Julia. 2010a. "Truth Commissions and National Curricula: The Case of Recordandonos in Peru." In *Children and Transitional Justice: Truth Telling, Accountability and Reconciliation*, edited by Sharanjeet Parmar, Mindy Jane Roseman, Saudamini Siegrist, and Theo Sowa, 327–64. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Paulson, Julia. 2010b. "History and Hysteria': Peru's Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Conflict in the National Curriculum." *International Journal for Education Law and Policy* [Special Issue]: 132–46.
- Paulson, Julia, and Jeremy Rappleye. 2007. "Education and Conflict: Review Essay." *International Journal of Educational Development* 27: 340–47.
- Perera, Lal, Swarna Wijetunge, and A. S. Balasooriya. 2004. "Education Reform and Political Violence in Sri Lanka." In *Education, Conflict and Social Cohesion*, edited by Sobhi Tawil and Alexandra Harley, 375–428. Geneva: UNESCO International Bureau for Education.
- Pigozzi, Mary Joy. 1999. *Education in Emergencies and for Reconstruction: A Developmental Approach*. New York: UNICEF.
- Quaynor, Laura J. 2012. "Citizenship Education in Postconflict Contexts: A Review of the Literature." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 7 (1): 33–57.
- Rohde, Achim. 2013. "Learning Each Other's Historical Narrative: A Road Map to Peace in Israel/Palestine?" In *History Education and Postconflict Reconciliation: Reconsidering Joint Textbook Projects*, edited by Karina V. Korostelina and Simone Lassig. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Sanchez Meertens, Ariel. 2013. "Courses of Conflict: Transmission of Knowledge and War's History in Eastern Sri Lanka." *History and Anthropology* 24 (2): 253–73.
- Sandelowski, Margarete, and Julie Barroso. 2007. *Handbook for Synthesizing Qualitative Research*. New York: Springer.
- Schucan Bird, Karen, and Janice Tripney. 2011. "Systematic Literature Searching in Policy Relevant, Inter-Disciplinary Reviews: An Example from Culture and Sport." *Research Synthesis Methods* 2: 163–73.

- Sinclair, Margaret. 2002. *Planning Education in and after Emergencies*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Stabback, Phillip. 2004. "Curriculum Development, Diversity and Division in Bosnia and Herzegovina." In *Education, Conflict and Social Cohesion*, edited by Sobhi Tawil and Alexandra Harley, 37–84. Geneva: UNESCO International Bureau for Education.
- Staeheli, Lynn A., and Daniel Hammett. 2013. "For the Future of the Nation': Citizenship, Nation and Education in South Africa." *Political Geography* 32: 32–41.
- Stover, Eric, and Harvey M. Weinstein, eds. 2004. *My Neighbor, My Enemy: Justice and Community in the Aftermath of Mass Atrocity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tawil, Sobhi, and Alexandra Harley, eds. 2004. *Education, Conflict and Social Cohesion*. Geneva: UNESCO International Bureau of Education.
- Torsti, Pilvi. 2007. "How to Deal with a Difficult Past? History Textbooks Supporting Enemy Images in Post-War Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 39 (1): 77–96.
- Torsti, Pilvi. 2009. "Segregated Education and Texts: A Challenge to Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina." *International Journal of World Peace* 29 (2): 65–82.
- Uppsala Conflict Data Program. 2014. "Definitions." Uppsala: Uppsala University. <http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/definitions/>.
- van Ommering, Erik. 2014. "Formal History Education in Lebanon: Crossroads, Past Conflicts and Prospects for Peace." *International Journal of Educational Development*.
- Weinstein, Harvey M., Sarah Warshauer Freedman, and Holly Hughson. 2007. "Challenges Facing Education Systems after Identity-Based Conflicts." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 2 (1): 41–71.
- Weldon, Gail. 2007. "History Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa." Cape Town: Western Cape Education Department. [http://www.mineducacion.gov.co/cvn/1665/articles-240963\\_archivo\\_pdf\\_Weldon.pdf](http://www.mineducacion.gov.co/cvn/1665/articles-240963_archivo_pdf_Weldon.pdf).
- Weldon, Gail. 2010. "History Education and Democracy in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *International Journal for Education Law and Policy* [Special Issue]: 80–93.
- Wertsch, James W. 2002. *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, James H., ed. 2014. (Re) *Constructing Memory: School Textbooks and the Imagination of the Nation*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

- Worden, Elizabeth Anderson. 2014. *National Identity and Educational Reform: Contested Classrooms*. New York: Routledge.
- Yogev, Esther. 2012. "The Image of the 1967 War in Israeli History Textbooks as Test Case: Studying an Active Past in a Protracted Regional Conflict." *Oxford Review of Education* 3: 171–88.
- Young, Elizabeth L. 2010. "Unifying History: An Examination of Official Narratives in the Republic of Yemen's Textbooks." *International Journal for Education Law and Policy* [Special Issue]: 20–32.
- Zembylas, Michalinos, and Zvi Bekerman. 2008. "Education and Dangerous Memories of Historical Trauma: Narratives of Pain, Narratives of Hope." *Curriculum Inquiry* 38 (2): 125–54.